REMARKS

Claims 9-13 and 17-27 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 9 and 13 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 9, 20, 23 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant Admitted Prior Art (FIGS. 36 and 37) (AAPA) in view of JP 2001-50264.

Claims 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the AAPA in view of JP '264, and further in view of Ashton (US 2,628,137).

Claims 13, 21, 24, 25 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the AAPA in view of JP '264 and WO 90/13167.

Claims 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the AAPA in view of JP '264 and Ashton.

Independent Claims 9 and 13

Independent claims 9 and 13 have been amended to recite that *a clearance between the inner ring and the outer ring is substantially equal to an axial length of the rolling element.* This is supported at least by the exemplary embodiment shown in FIG. 1 in which the clearance between the rings 1, 2 is substantially equal to the axial length of the rolling element 5. Since there is a clearance between the inner ring and the outer ring that is substantially equal to an axial length of the rolling element, the rolling element can be inserted into the clearance as shown in Fig. 1 after assembling the bearing rings. After inserting the rolling element, the rolling element is rotated in the space defined between the inner and outer rings by using the groove.

Applicant respectfully submits that these is no reasonable combination of the applied references that would meet every feature of these amended claims. For example, there is not reasonable combination of the applied references in which (1) each of the pair of bearing rings is monolithically formed, and (2) a clearance between the inner ring and the outer ring is substantially equal to an axial length of the rolling element.

As an initial matter, Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner's attention to the fact that FIGS. 36 and 37 are explanatory drawings of JP '264.[1] Nevertheless, neither of these references disclosed or suggests all of the recitations of amended claims 9 and 13.

None of the embodiments of JP '364 (and therefore also the AAPA) discloses that a clearance between the inner ring and the outer ring is *substantially equal to an axial length of the rolling element*.

The only embodiment of JP '264 that includes monolithic inner and outer rings is the fifth embodiment shown in FIG. 6 of JP '264. In all other configurations, at least one of the inner and outer rings are *formed separately* and, therefore, the rolling elements are inserted *before* assembling the separated inner or outer ring.

The Examiner asserts that the AAPA discloses that, due to the size of the entrance space between the raceways 40, 30, the rolling element is inserted through the opening and into the grooves of the raceway during assembling.[2] However, the Examiner is misapprehending this disclosure of the embodiments of JP '264.

[1] See original specification at page 3, line 15, to page 5, line 1.

[2] See Office Action dated September 9, 2008, at page 2.

In fact, although FIG. 6 of JP '264 discloses a bearing having inner and outer rings formed monolithically, paragraph [0028] of JP '264, explains the fifth embodiment as follows (emphasis added):

> [0028] <Firth embodiment>
>
> Fig. 6 shows the fifth embodiment. In this embodiment, as shown in the figure, an outer ring 1 and an inner ring 2 are formed monolithically, a rolling element entering hole is provided on the outer ring 1, and instead of the cage 6 of the first embodiment, a separator (spacer) 8, which is shown in Fig. 7 in enlarged manner, guides the rolling elements 5,5. According to this configuration, the bearing can be made more compact. Other configuration and the effects are the same as that of the first embodiment.

That is, in the fifth embodiment of JP '264 (and therefore the AAPA), there is a rolling element entering hole on the outer ring 1. Thus, the rolling bearing is assembled *by inserting the rolling element through this entering hole* and not through the clearance between the rings.

Moreover, with respect to claim 13, WO '167, which the Examiner asserts as showing features of a drive motor, does not make up for the deficiencies in the AAPA and JP '264.

Therefore, for the reasons discussed above, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of independent claims 9 and 13.

Dependent Claims

In addition, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of dependent claims 13, 20, 21, and 23-27 at least because of their dependency from claim 9 or claim 13.

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of dependent claims 10-12 and 17-19 at least because of their dependency from claim 9 or claim 13 and because Ashton, which the Examiner cites as showing features of the retainer, does not make up for the deficiencies discussed above.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/John M. Bird/

John M. Bird
Registration No. 46,027

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860
WASHINGTON DC SUGHRUE/265550
65565
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: December 4, 2008